

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith, which place the application in compliance for allowance. The present amendment is made to facilitate prosecution of the application.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-21 are pending in this application. Independent claims 1, 8, and 15 are hereby amended. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed and specifically at Figures 3, 6, and 8.

No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-5, 7-12, 14-19 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,226,038 to Frink et al. (hereinafter, merely “Frink”).

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

“An editing device that is installed in a computer to edit a high-definition television signal, the editing device comprising:

... edit processing means for performing edit processing on the high-definition television video data decompressed by the first decoder and the high-definition television video data decompressed by the second decoder, a result of edit processing performed by the edit processing means being output,

wherein the edit processing means and first decoder are contained on a first PCI card, and the second decoder is contained on a separate second PCI card, the first PCI card being directly connected to the second PCI card. (Emphasis added)

As understood by Applicants, Frink relates to a non-linear system for editing HDTV video data such as to provide output in standard definition resolution.

Generally, the present application relates to a system, with at least two decoders to decompress compressed HDTV data, and an editing means to edit and apply a special effect to the decompressed HDTV data from the decoders. The result of editing is then sent to an output for display. The present application allows for real-time editing of HDTV data with the use of merely a computer, and requiring specialized or dedicated hardware.

It is respectfully submitted that Frink does not disclose or suggest the above-recited features of independent claim 1. Specifically, Frink fails to disclose or suggest a HDTV editing system in which a first card has a first decoder and edit processing means, and a second card has a second decoder, and the cards are directly connected to each other. This distinct structure allows two pieces of HDTV video data to be transferred in parallel from a computer to the PCI cards so as to be subjected to edit processing, regardless of a limited bandwidth of a PCI bus.

Therefore for at least the reasons given, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is patentable.

Independent claims 8, and 15 recite similar, or somewhat similar, features and are therefore also patentable for similar, or somewhat similar, reasons.

Claims 6, 13, and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Frink in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0168036 to Kim

(hereinafter "Kim"). Claims 6, 13, and 20 are dependent from one of the independent claims discussed above, and are therefore believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each of these dependent claims is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

III. DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The other claims in this application are each dependent on an independent claim discussed above, and are therefore believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

Similarly, because Applicants maintain that all claims are allowable for at least the reasons presented hereinabove, in the interests of brevity, this response does not comment on each and every comment made by the Examiner in the Office Action. This should not be taken as acquiescence of the substance of those comments, and Applicants reserve the right to address such comments.

CONCLUSION

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosures in the cited reference or references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the reference, or references, providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable and Applicants respectfully request early passage to issue of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By



Thomas F. Presson
Reg. No. 41,442
(212) 588-0800